IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

COMPANY PETITION NO. 323 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange, Mumbai ..Petitioners.

V/s.

Prism Mills Ltd. ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 100 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange, Mumbai .. Petitioners.

v/s.
Ghar Finance & Leasing Co. Ltd. ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 121 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange, Mumbai ..Petitioners.

v/s.
Silkon Silk Mills (Exports) Ltd. ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 122 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange Mumbai ..Petitioners.

v/s.
Madalso Agrotech Ltd. ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 123 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange, Mumbai ..Petitioners.

v/s.
Sharda Textile Mills (I)Ltd., ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 125 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange, Mumbai .. Petitioners.

v/s.

Kedia Construction Co. Ltd., ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 326 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange, Mumbai. .. Petitioners.

v/s.
Trident Steels Ltd., ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 640 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange Mumbai .. Petitioners.

v/s.
Amethi Textile Ltd., ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 656 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange Mumbai ..Petitioners.

v/s.
Emaai Pharma Ltd., ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 657 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange Mumbai .. Petitioners.

v/s.

Sushant Capitals Ltd., ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 1013 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange Mumbai .. Petitioners.

v/s.
Khandelwal Herrmann Electronics Ltd. ..Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 1018 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange Mumbai .. Petitioners.

v/s.
Kirti Investments Ltd., .. Respondents.

WITH
COMPANY PETITION NO. 1027 OF 2000

The Stock Exchange Mumbai .. Petitioners.

v/s.

Lilac Exports Ltd., ..Respondents.

Mr. Mahesh Shukla i/by Desai & Diwanji for the Petitioners.

None for the Respondents.

CORAM : S.C. DHARMADHIKARI,J.

DATED : 07TH APRIL, 2006

PC :

1. The Stock Exchange has filed these petitions for winding up of the companies because the listing charges were not paid. The learned Advocate appearing in support of these petitions states that the Stock Exchange does not wish to prosecute these petitions. Although the petitions are admitted, the petitioners are not interested in prosecuting the same. Since the petitioners expressed this desire, a direction was issued that each of these petitions be advertised for withdrawal in two news papers. The learned Advocate appearing for the petitioners states that the petitions have been advertised for withdrawal long back on 24th February, 2006 but none have come forward to continue the petitions. The learned counsel points out that one of the companies against whom the company petition No. 326/2000 has been filed, has already been ordered to be wound up by this court. As far as other companies are concerned, their creditors / contributors have not come forward despite public advertisement and notice.

2. Under the circumstances, all these company petitions are allowed to be withdrawn and dismissed for non prosecution.

7.4.2006 (S.C.Dharmadhikari,J)